



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,636	11/17/2005	Sjoerd Stallinga	NL030541	4514
24737	7590	06/25/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			KAYRISH, MATTHEW	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2627	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/557,636	STALLINGA, SJOERD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MATTHEW G. KAYRISH	2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 11-16, 18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 17, 19, 23 and 24 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 5/27/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Method for radial tracking in an optical disc drive, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/27/2008.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Optical System for Detecting and Correcting Radial Tracking Based on a Wobble Induced Signal"

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:

The phrase "...error signal is derived from the **datainduced** signal components..." is recited in the abstract and is unclear as written. The examiner recommends changing "datainduced" to either --data induced-- or --data-induced--.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 3, line 25 states "...an alternative embodiment of an adaptive signal processing". The examiner believes that this should actually read --an adaptive signal processor--.

Page 8, line 16 states "...and has a second input 122 coupled..." The examiner believes that this should read --...and has a second input 132 coupled...-- to be consistent with the figures.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to because:

Numerous symbols in the specification are not consistent with the figures. Specifically, items 110a-110d, 111a-111d, 112a-112d, 125a-125d, 126a-126d, 151a-151d, 310a-310d and 410a-410d are not consistent with the figures because the specification contains lower-case letters while the figures contain upper-case letters.

Page 12, line 30 states the reference labels 311a-311d and 411a-411d, which are not clearly labeled in the figures.

Page 13, lines 17 & 18 states the reference symbol "s", i.e. lower-case 's' which is not consistent with the figures.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al (US PG-Pub 2002/0080700).

Regarding claim 11, Watanabe discloses:

Optical disc drive, comprising:

An optical system (figure 1) for scanning an optical disc (figure 1, item 12) with a light beam (figure 1, item 11), the optical system comprising an optical detector (figure 1, item 15) for receiving light reflected by the optical disc (paragraph 97);

A radial actuator (figure 1, item 9) for radially displacing a focal spot of the light beam (paragraphs 93-95);

A control circuit (figure 1) having an input (figure 1, items 20a-20d) for receiving an output signal of said optical detector (paragraph 97), and having an output for generating a control signal for said radial actuator (paragraph 99);

Wherein said control circuit is capable of operating in at least a first operating mode (paragraphs 136-138; startup mode) wherein said control signal for said radial actuator is generated on the basis of a tracking error signal derived from wobble-induced signal components of said optical detector output signal (paragraphs 97-99 & 136-138).

Regarding claim 12, Watanabe further discloses:

Wherein said control circuit is capable of processing said optical detector output signal for calculating a tracking error signal depending on a delay between signal components (paragraph 99).

Regarding claim 13, Watanabe further discloses:

Wherein said optical detector is a four-segment detector (figure 2, item 15).

Regarding claim 14, Watanabe further discloses:

Wherein said control circuit is capable of operating in at least a second operating mode (figure 8, 1x, 2x, 4x; paragraphs 148-150) wherein said control signal for said

radial actuator is generated on the basis of a tracking error signal derived from data-induced signal components of said optical detector output signal (paragraphs 97-98).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al, in view of Furuyama (US Patent Number 4847708).

Regarding claim 15, Watanabe discloses the features of base claim 14, as stated in the 102 rejection above, but fails to specifically disclose:

Wherein said control circuit is adapted to monitor said optical detector output signal, and to operate in said first operating mode when said optical detector output signal indicates an unwritten track, and to operate in said second operating mode when said optical detector output signal indicates a written track.

Furuyama discloses:

Optical disc drive, comprising:

An optical system (column 6, lines 44-48) for scanning an optical disc (column 6, lines 28-37) with a light beam (column 6, lines 30-31; LD), the optical system comprising

an optical detector for receiving light reflected by the optical disc (column 6, lines 49-54; must be a detector);

A radial actuator for radially displacing a focal spot of the light beam (column 7, lines 27-34);

A control circuit (figure 1) having an input (figure 1, items 20a-20d) for receiving an output signal of said optical detector (paragraph 97), and having an output for generating a control signal for said radial actuator (paragraph 99);

Wherein said control circuit is capable of operating in at least a first operating mode (column 16, lines 9-36; recording mode);

Wherein said control circuit is capable of operating in at least a second operating mode (column 6, lines 49-54; reproduction mode);

Wherein said control circuit is adapted to monitor said optical detector output signal (figure 10, S62), and to operate in said first operating mode when said optical detector output signal indicates an unwritten track (column 16, lines 23-27; columns 13-15 describe the process of figure 10 to determine an unrecorded track address suitable for a new recording), and to operate in said second operating mode when said optical detector output signal indicates a written track (figure 4; column 9, lines 24-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide for the system of Watanabe to operate in various modes based on the presence of an RF signal, as taught by Furuyama, because this is an obvious determination of the presence of a track applied to an optical

system for the purpose of detecting the presence of recorded track to determine if the address is a suitable location for recording.

Regarding claims 16 & 18, Watanabe and Furuyama disclose the features of base claim 15, as stated in the 103 rejection above, and Furuyama further discloses:

Wherein said control circuit is adapted to monitor the signal power of low-frequency signal components of said optical detector output signal (figures 3-5, S17 & S23), to compare the measured signal power with a predetermined reference level, and to operate in said first operating mode when said measured signal power is above/below said reference level (figures 3-5, S4 & S5 indicate an unwritten track when RF signal is NOT present), and to operate in said second operating mode when said measured signal power is below/above said reference level (figures 3-5, S4 & S5 indicate an unwritten track when RF signal is NOT present);

Furuyama fails to specifically disclose, with reference to claim 16:

Wherein when the reference is above a reference level to operate in a first operating mode, and when the reference is below a reference level to operate in a second operating mode.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a simple substitution of the thresholds which are indicative of either an unwritten track or a written track, because this is an obvious variation which would yield the same expected results.

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al, in view of Kawabata et al (US Patent Number 6222340).

Regarding claim 20, Watanabe discloses the features of claims 1 and 14, as stated in the 102 rejection above, but fails to specifically disclose:

Wherein said control circuit has a first signal processing path for processing said optical detector output signal in said first operative mode, wherein said control circuit has a second signal processing path for processing said optical detector output signal in said second operative mode, and a controllable switch for selecting either said first signal processing path or said second signal processing path.

Kawabata discloses:

Optical disc drive, comprising:

An optical system (figure 1) for scanning an optical disc (figure 1, item 57) with a light beam (figure 1, unlabeled), the optical system comprising an optical detector (figure 1, item 28) for receiving light reflected by the optical disc (column 10, lines 7-16);

A radial actuator (figure 1, items 51, 56 & 57) for radially displacing a focal spot of the light beam (columns 7 & 8, lines 58-67 & 1-15);

A control circuit (figure 1, item 1) having an input (figure 1, output of item 34) for receiving an output signal of said optical detector (column 10, lines 17-35), and having an output for generating a control signal for said radial actuator (column 10, lines 37-40);

Wherein said control circuit has a first signal processing path (figure 1, item 22) for processing said optical detector output signal in said first operative mode (column 9,

lines 46-59; A-phase), wherein said control circuit has a second signal processing path (figure 1, item 23) for processing said optical detector output signal in said second operative mode (column 9, lines 46-59; B-phase), and a controllable switch for selecting either said first signal processing path or said second signal processing path (columns 9 & 10, lines 46-67 & 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the control circuit of Watanabe with two different paths for the controlling circuit of Watanabe for controlling the two different modes of the signal processing error correction, as taught by Kawabata, because this will help to drive the stepping motor with respect to two different signal and two different phases, as stated in column 9, lines 46-59.

11. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al, in view of Ohshita et al (US Patent Number 6317394).

Regarding claim 21, Watanabe discloses the features of base claim 14, as stated in the 103 rejection above, but fails to specifically disclose:

Wherein said control circuit comprises an input filter assembly having a controllable filter characteristic.

Ohshita discloses:

Optical disc drive, comprising:

An optical system for scanning an optical disc with a light beam (abstract), the optical system comprising an optical detector (column 7, lines 22-28) for receiving light reflected by the optical disc (column 7, lines 22-28);

A radial actuator for radially displacing a focal spot of the light beam (abstract);

A control circuit (figure 1, item 4) having an input (figure 1, item e_1) for receiving an output signal of said optical detector (column 7, lines 28-38), and having an output for generating a control signal for said radial actuator (column 7, lines 55-60);

Wherein said control circuit comprises an input filter assembly having a controllable filter characteristic (columns 13 & 14, lines 1-13 and 7-14, respectively).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the control circuit for tracking error correction of Watanabe with a controllable filter characteristic, as taught by Ohshita, because this will help the lowpass filters to adjust for large signal changes in the tracking, thus enabling further offset correction, as stated in columns 13, lines 62-67 and column 14, lines 1-6.

12. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al and Ohshita et al, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Furuyama.

Regarding claim 22, Watanabe and Ohshita disclose the features of claim 21, as stated in the 103 rejection above, but fail to specifically disclose:

Wherein said input filter assembly comprises at least one controllable filter device having a signal input coupled to a optical detector input of the control circuit, having a

signal output, and having a control input, the controllable filter device being designed to pass signal components in a low-frequency range and to block signal components in a data-frequency range in response to a control signal received at its control input having a first value, the controllable filter device being designed to block signal components in said low-frequency range and to pass signal components in said data-frequency range in response to said control signal received at its control input having a second value.

Furuyama discloses:

Wherein said control circuit comprises an input assembly having a controllable characteristic (figure 3, S4 & S5);

Wherein said input filter assembly comprises at least one controllable device having a signal input coupled to a optical detector input of the control circuit (figure 1, S1), having a signal output (figure 3), and having a control input, the controllable input device being designed to pass signal components in a low-frequency range (figure 5, output 'NO' of S23) and to block signal components in a data-frequency range (figure 5, output 'YES' of S23) in response to a control signal received at its control input having a first value (figure 3; 'Detecting Start Position of Unrecorded Track'), the controllable input device being designed to block signal components in said low-frequency range (figure 4, output of 'NO' of S17) and to pass signal components in said data-frequency range (figure 4, output of 'YES' of S17) in response to said control signal received at its control input having a second value (figure 3; 'Detecting Start Position of Unrecorded Track').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the input filter assembly of Watanabe with the ability to pass RF data signals or to block RF data signals based on the operating mode, as taught by Furuyama, because this will provide for the system to perform the desired task based on the desired mode of operation (recording or reproducing), as displayed by figures 3-5 and fully explained in columns 8-10.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 17, 19, 23 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW G. KAYRISH whose telephone number is (571)272-4220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew G Kayrish/
Examiner
Art Unit 2627
6/16/2008

/Andrea L Wellington/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2627